

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 15 are presented for consideration. Claims 1 and 15 are independent.

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the original specification, at least at, for example, page 15, line 10, *et seq*, and Figures 3-5. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Yoshida '005 in view of Hayashi et al. '809. Claims 2-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Yoshida '005 in view of Hayashi et al. '809, and further in view of Dow et al. '904.

At least for the following reasons, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 relates to a method of reading a plurality of film originals, each being mounted with a slide mount, which are placed on an original support of an image reading apparatus and displaying them on a monitor unit of a computer connected to the image reading apparatus. As amended, the method includes an image reading step of reading each of the images of the originals placed on the original support, identifying a number of frames of film originals simultaneously present on the original support, and cutting out image areas of frames of the film originals to generate image signals. Also included is a placement orientation detection step of detecting placement orientation of the original as to whether it is landscape or portrait, based on lengths in horizontal and vertical directions of the image signal generated in the image reading step, an image signal rotation step of rotating the image signal to be in a landscape placement, when the placement orientation of the original detected in the placement orientation detection step is different from the landscape placement, and a read image signal display step of

simultaneously displaying the plurality of read image signals on one display screen of the monitor unit in the landscape placement and in a form of a thumbnail type display.

Yoshida relates to an image processing apparatus that controls a blank to be a predetermined length in accordance with the size of the recording medium. The portion of Yoshida cited in the Office Action, on page 3, discloses an optical system which sequentially reads image signals corresponding to one line, along the main scanning direction, of a manuscript. (Column 3, Lines 28-34). However, in contrast to Applicant's Claim 1, Yoshida does not teach or suggest, among other features, an image reading step of, *inter alia*, identifying a number of frames of film originals simultaneously present on the original support.

Hayashi et al. relates to a color film analyzing method and apparatus. Figure 1 of Hayashi et al. shows a perspective view of the color film analyzer. Spliced color film is withdrawn from a film supply reel 11 and an individual frame is positioned at a measuring station where the sensor unit 58 measures the picture frame. The film is then transported to an image pickup station where an image of the picture frame is picked up by a TV camera. Hayashi et al. states that a utility space 22 is provided to ensure that each picture frame is separately measured and picked up. (Column 4, Lines 21-45). Therefore, in Hayashi et al., only one picture frame occupies the measuring station or the image pickup station at a time. Thus, Hayashi et al., does not teach or suggest, among other features, an image reading step of, *inter alia*, identifying a number of frames of film originals simultaneously present on the original support.

Accordingly, even assuming, *arguendo*, that the combination of Yoshida and Hayashi et al., is proper the proposed combination does not disclose features of Applicant's invention as recited in Claim 1.

Independent Claim 15 relates to a system for reading a plurality of film originals.

Applicant submits that Claim 15 generally corresponds to Claim 1, and has been amended in a similar manner. Therefore, at least for the reasons discussed above in regard to Claim 1, Applicant submits that the applied references do not disclose features of Applicant's invention as recited in Claim 15.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 depend from Claim 1. As noted above, Claims 2-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Yoshida '005 in view of Hayashi et al. '809 and Dow et al. '904. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Dow et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Yoshida and Hayashi et al. discussed above. Therefore, at least for the reasons discussed above in regard to Claim 1, Applicant submits that the applied references do not disclose features of Applicant's invention as recited in Claims 2-6.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

At least for the reasons discussed above, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claims 1 and 15 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 2-6 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested. Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C., office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean M. Walsh/

Sean M. Walsh
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 63,510

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
SMW:ayr

FCHS_WS 3665946v1